

**COURT OF APPEALS
DECISION
DATED AND FILED**

December 30, 2014

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Court of Appeals

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See WIS. STAT. § 808.10 and RULE 809.62.

Appeal No. 2014AP578

Cir. Ct. No. 2013PR3

STATE OF WISCONSIN

**IN COURT OF APPEALS
DISTRICT III**

IN RE THE ESTATE OF PETER J. SELENSKE:

RICHARD SELENSKE,

APPELLANT,

V.

ESTATE OF LOUISE SELENSKE,

RESPONDENT.

APPEAL from an order of the circuit court for Langlade County:
FRED W. KAWALSKI, Judge. *Affirmed.*

Before Hoover, P.J., Stark and Hruz, JJ.

¶1 PER CURIAM. Richard Selenske, pro se, appeals an order denying his petition to probate the will of his father, Peter Selenske, twenty-eight years after Peter's death. This is Selenske's ninth appeal related to the probate and

distribution of assets from his parents' respective estates. For the reasons outlined below, we affirm the order.

¶2 In his most recent appeals, *Selenske v. Estate of Louise Selenske*, Nos. 2012AP644/2012AP1093/2012AP1829, unpublished slip op. (WI App June 18, 2013), we admonished both parties for making assertions unsupported by citations to the appellate record. We noted that our review of the matter had been unnecessarily complicated by the parties' lack of citation to the record, citations that did not always support the allegations of fact made in the briefs, and the continuation of self-serving arguments that caused both this court and the circuit court delay and frustration. *Id.*, ¶19 n.5. Significantly, we warned that "future violations of the rules of appellate procedure may result in sanctions." *Id.*

¶3 As noted above, Selenske appears pro se in this appeal. The court may give leeway to a pro se party, but pro se parties must still comply with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law. *See Waushara Cnty. v. Graf*, 166 Wis. 2d 442, 452, 480 N.W.2d 16 (1992). Given the recent warning noted above, and the eight prior appeals related to these matters, Selenske should be well-advised of our appellate rules for briefing. *See WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19* (2011-12). Selenske's pro se status does not, therefore, excuse his failure to provide a statement of facts with appropriate citation to the record, nor his failure to present a cogent argument related to the basis for the trial court's decision and why it should be reversed. Inadequate argument will not be considered, *see State v. Shaffer*, 96 Wis. 2d 531, 545-46 n.3, 292 N.W.2d 370 (Ct. App. 1980), nor will we abandon our neutrality by developing Selenske's arguments for him, *see Barakat v. DHSS*, 191 Wis. 2d 769, 786, 530 N.W.2d 392 (Ct. App. 1995). Selenske's inadequate briefing fails to persuade this court of any circuit court error.

By the Court.—Order affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. See WIS. STAT. RULE
809.23(1)(b)5. (2011-12).

